

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (HWG)**  
Conference Call Notes of the Call on July 8, 2005

***Draft of July 9, 2005***

The Hydrology and Water Quality Working Group (HWG) conferred by phone at 10 a.m. Central on June 8. The following is a summary of topics in that call.

**Participants**

**Facilitator:** JOSEPH MCMAHON

**Participant list for our call** (advise me of any missing names):

BOB BACON, COALITION TO PROTECT THE MISSOURI RIVER; BOB RIEHL, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION; DAVID BARFIELD, KANSAS DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES; DON JORGENSEN, MISSOURI RIVER TECHNICAL GROUP; JEFF SHAFER, NEBRASKA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES; JOAN STEMLER, US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS; JODY FARHAT, US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS; JOE GIBBS, MISSOURI LEVEE & DRAINAGE DISTRICT ASSOCIATION; JOHN SHADLE, NEBRASKA PUBLIC POWER DISTRICT; MARK RATH, SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES; MIKE LEVALLEY, US FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE; RICK INGLIS, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE; ROBERT L. PEARCE, US ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, RET.; WAYNE STANCILL, US FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE; ROBB JACOBSON, US GEOLOGICAL SURVEY; DR. DAVID GALAT, US GEOLOGICAL SURVEY; DALE BLEVINS, US GEOLOGICAL SURVEY; MIKE SWENSON, USACE; MIKE OLSEN, USFWS.

**Our Path Forward/schedule.**

Date	Event	Who
Monday July 11, 005	Pallid Sturgeon Group (PSG) via Robb Jacobson sends out its “matrix” on “quasi natural hydrograph”	Robb Jacobson
Tuesday July 12, 2005, 3 p.m. Central Time, 2 p.m. Mountain.	HWG conference call (call in information to be sent via e-mail)	All Group Members
ASAP	COE posts last 6 runs on their web site	Mike Swenson
Wednesday, July 20, 2005, 9 a.m., Meeting Rooms @ The Civic Center Hilton at 1001 Cass St, Omaha, NE	Technical Working Group Meeting	All Group Members
Tuesday, July 26, 2005, NPS Office, 601 Riverfront Drive, Omaha, NE 68102	Technical Working Group representatives present information to the full Plenary Group	Representatives selected by the HWG

**Omaha Travel Note:** We have asked for compensatory meetings rooms from the Hilton Omaha (1001 Cass St., +1-402-998-3400) because we believe that our Technical Working Group

participants will stay at their hotel. Please book into that hotel if feasible for your stay in Omaha for our July 20-21 meetings. The rates we have been advised are: USD 68 for Tribal, Federal and State; USD 109 for others. For reduced government rates, ask for the “Missouri River Spring Rise Facilitation.”

**Topics for our upcoming July 12, 2005 conference call.**

- Group responses to:
  - The PSG Quasi Natural Alternative Matrix
  - The proposals contained in the Mark Rath email of July 7, 2005.
  - “Supplement to Spring Rise Alternatives Report” and additional modeling runs by the COE
- Discussion of “Stop Protocol” and preclude options (See Dave Barfield email of July 8 to you).
- Discussion of monitoring and evaluation issues.
- Flood Control Constraints
  - What do they mean in layman’s terms? (or even in hydrologist terms)
  - Are there ways to use both storage and runoff predictions
  - Should we make the dates for decisions later in the year?
- Selection of HWG representatives to the Plenary for final briefing.
- Identification of Options to send to the Plenary
  - Which seem the best?
  - Can we find 4-6 options that seem to be the best?
  - What is needed to improve and study them?
  - What is the form of report (do we use the Mark Rath format?)
  - What other information should be given to the Plenary by this Group?
  - What does this Group recommend to the Plenary for MRRIC consideration?
- Other topics added by Group members.
- Water Quality – Dale Blevin’s paper as a start point.
- Do we need another call (perhaps on July 15, 2005)?

**Key discussion topics on our July 8, 2005 conference call.**

**Modeling needs.** Discussion included consideration of several modeling matters including:

- How to use models other than the RoR (such as AOP (not yet done), UNET, etc).
- Can we get not only flow but stage information that may be more useful to downstream stakeholders?

**Pallid Sturgeon Group Recommendation.** It was generally described and the paper “Quasi Natural Alternative” was also discussed. This draft document was presented to address the use of percentiles as methods for assessing the five factors that the PSG considers most important. This will be a discussion item for the future and our next conference call.

**What is the goal of this process?** It is just the Pallid Sturgeon? The Group discussion was of the goal of removing jeopardy for the Pallid Sturgeon while recognizing the other authorized water needs and uses.

**Flood Control Constraints.** Some explanation is contained in Tables 1 and 2 of the COE Supplement report sent by email. There still appears to be a need for better understanding of how the constraints operate. The COE suggests that stakeholders review the “Summary of Operations” on the COE site for the Missouri River. David Barfield suggests that there is close to a consensus that flood control constraints in a Hydrology Group proposal should be left as close as possible to existing flood control constraints.

**Delayed Second Rise/July Rise and Bird Issues.** The Agency group reports via FWS that the option for a delayed Second Rise is not feasible for 2006 due to lack of appropriate habitat. This may be a future option but the timing is uncertain...perhaps as early as 2008. The PSG representatives suggested that mid May is preferred time for a peak; David Galat does not recommend the HWG pursue a July peak as an option.

**Temperature data.** Water temperature data are still limited, but David Galat is assembling some information.

**Water quality, chemistry, turbidity.** Discussion indicates that there are not a lot of data on these issues. Consequently, this will be a monitoring and evaluation issue for the Spring Rise. Dale Blevin’s paper was sent out via email to Group members on Friday, July 8, 2005.

**Limitations on this Summary Document:** Plenary and Technical Working Group meeting notes are intended to be a general summary of key issues raised and discussed by participants at meetings. The presentation of issues or items discussed is not designed to be totally comprehensive, or reflect the breadth or depth of discussions. However, it is intended to record the gist of conversations and conclusions. Where a consensus or other agreement was reached, it will be so noted. Where ideas or comments are from only one or several participants, or where a brainstormed list is presented, the content of which was not agreed to by all group members, the recorders will to the best of their abilities note these qualifiers. When participants raise comments about the meeting notes, or make other suggestions or comments following meetings which are more than “corrections,” we will add these in a section at the end of the meeting notes captioned “Post Script.”

This Conference Call Summary is the independent work product of the mediation team from CDR Associates, an independent conflict management firm working under contract to the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution, which is serving in a neutral capacity to assist in the resolution of issues in an alternative dispute resolution process. Ideas developed or proposals discussed during deliberations by either the Plenary Group or Technical Working Group, or agreements or recommendations reached in either forum and recorded in Meeting Summaries are considered to be tentative and subject to review and/or approval by the leadership of participating federal, tribal and state agencies.